

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
36	As a result of an answer you provided earlier regarding the requirement to use 12 pt arial font, even in figures and graphics, may we use an 11x17 inch page in our technical narrative?	No only use 8 1/2" by 11" only
37	The RFP states that we are allowed "additional pages" for Evidence of Agent authority, yet the Section L Proposal Submission Chart allows "1 page to document evidence of authority." Our evidence of authority document is in excess of 1 page in length. Which of the two stated requirements is correct?	The Attachment 0001 Section L & M Chart will be amended to allow multiple pages for evidence of authority to match section L. However as stated, the additional pages are limited to the requested information and any additional information included will be removed and not considered. The intent is to ensure signatories are authorized to sign and no other information should be included.
38	The RFP states that in the Administrative Section we are allowed "up to 2 pages for cover letter or title page of proposal, yet the Section L Proposal Submission Chart suggests 2 pages per each of the administrative categories. Which of the two stated requirements is correct?	Section L chart is not intended to be cumulative. The administration section as a whole is intended to be 2 pages. (with exception for evidence of authority)
39	May we include a Table of Contents outside the page count restrictions?	No, this proposal submission is very small. Offerors may include blank pages as dividers between sections, electronic tabs on the first page of each section, or any other type of blank divider, to identify sections.
40	Would Government kindly permit a no smaller than 9 point Arial font for headers and footers? Also, would the Government permit no smaller than 10 point Arial font for Tables and Graphics.	No changes to fonts are authorized
41	Please provide direction on what the Government considers "evidence of that agent's authority,".	Evidence of authority is intended to be the organizations method of providing binding signature authorization to contracts managers or others in the company that are other than officers of the organization. Typically this is provided as a letter from one of the officers of the organization including stating any limits to the authority
42	Will the government be issuing an amendment to the solicitation incorporating the revised instructions IAW the Q&A's provided?	Yes, if any of the instructions change the instructions provided. Amendment 001 is pending making small administrative changes noted in these Q&A's.

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
43	Will the Government please clarify where the Offeror is to sign the Section K - electronic reps and certs document? Is it sufficient that they are incorporated into our proposal submission and that the cover page is signed by an authorized representative?	<p>Section K is part of the Solicitation itself. If the front page of the solicitation is signed then the section K is signed.</p> <p>The Certifications and Representations online are a separate submission that includes clauses and signature online. A copy of this document is required.</p>
44	Are Offerors required to have DCAA-approved Accounting, Purchasing & Billing Systems?	This is not a requirement of eligibility for a BOA.
45	There are a number of Cloud Service Offerings going through the DoD RMF process that Army may want to leverage under ACCENT. Would you consider a Quarterly, or at least semi-annual, update of DoD-PA certifications.	The intent is at least annually, however if there are pending requirements all submitted requests for BOA review or change of Certifications will be considered.
46	Items 1-6 Are these items to be addressed in a proposal transmittal letter or as separate paragraphs in the Administrative Section of the proposal?	Yes, these are to be addressed all in one section. Many of the items addressed are normally addressed in a transmittal letter. If a transmittal letter is the format chosen to address the items, that is acceptable as long as page count is followed.
47	What qualifies as demonstration of ability?	<p>Section M states:</p> <p>"The USG will evaluate the offerors demonstrated ability to perform transition and modernization for an impact level 2 application migrating to a commercial cloud environment.</p> <p>Proposals will be evaluated on whether a thorough and detailed narrative was provided which clearly demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and an ability to execute the requirements in accordance with Section L requirements."</p>
48	Will discussion of any experience be allowed if relevant or will only discussion of Impact Level 2 experience be accepted?	The USG is not evaluating experience. No discussion of experience is requested.
49	Item 3 requests the signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal. Is this section/requirement the proposal transmittal letter or the signed SF33 or just the signature shown in a table in this paragraph of the proposal?	Actual signatures are not always legible. A printed name, address, telephone, and electronic address is requested within the administrative section of the proposal. This can be done via transmittal letter, with evidence of authority, or merely included within the administrative section of the proposal (with evidence of authority)

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
50	The solicitation and PWS states this is a procurement for commercial cloud solutions. The contract provisions included in Section I does not include FAR 52.212 provisions for Commercial Items. Will the Government incorporate FAR 52.212 provisions identified on page 10 in Section I?	Please see page 10 of the RFP. This section lists the commercial clauses that may be added for Task Order competitions.
51	Will offerors be considered compliant if they propose clarifications and/or additional T&Cs to those included in the solicitation?	Clarifications should be resolved prior to submitting a proposal. Adding Terms and conditions to the proposal submission may make the proposal non-compliant. The BOA award is intended to start all offerors on the same agreement. This initial step (Award of BOA) should not be the place to negotiate additional terms and conditions as there is nothing actually being awarded here.
52	The solicitation includes FAR 52.204-7 , 52.204-8 that state the offeror may use its representations and certifications in SAM in lieu of completing the individual representations and certifications in Section K of the solicitation. Since the offerors are not proposing a specific solution and no cost or pricing data is provided at this time, is it correct that for purpose of the BOA proposal, the offeror may claim paragraph (2)(i) of FAR 52.204-7 and use it SAM representations and certifications and that this approach will be considered compliant? If not, please clarify what is required.	There is not a FAR PART 52.204-7(2)(i). However, the USG believes the question is "is it considered compliant to just reference the Certs in Reps are completed in the proposal?" No, please provide an electronic version of the Certifications and Representations in your proposal submission. If section K in the RFP is completely filled in by the clauses addressed in the Certs and Reps submitted, it may not be necessary to fill in section K. (It may be redundant) However please submit a FULL signed solicitation AND a FULL electronic version of the Certifications and Representations. Both are available as a .PDF file for submission in proposals.
53	Does the government want a printed copy of the offeror's representations and certifications in SAM or only acknowledgement in 52.204-7 (b)(2) (i) that paragraph (d) applies? If paragraph (d) applies, is it correct the other provisions in Section K are not be completed by the offeror?	If the offeror ensures all Section K clauses are addressed in Certifications and Representations, it may not be necessary to fill in Section K, however, a full version of BOTH documents is necessary.
54	The Evaluation factor for the Administrative Section, items 2 through 6, is "compliance". Please clarify how each Item is determined to be compliant.	Page 61 of the RFP defines compliance as " Compliance is defined as providing all information as requested in a usable format."
55	What proof of registration in SAM is required to be considered compliant? Are offerors to provide only the cage number associated with SAM registration?	Attachment 0001 L&M Charts under "M 9" states: "Use of CAGE indicates registration in SAM" CAGE code is sufficient.

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
56	The application and mission owner might not know what combination of cloud transition support services and cloud hosting is required until the initial application assessment is complete. Will the BOA allow the offeror to bid on any cloud transition support services (to include initial application assessment) even though they might not have a DoD-PA for a specific cloud hosting service?	In order to bid on any of the ACCENT requirements, a DOD PA will be required. We do not anticipate there being any opportunities where transition is separate from the Cloud services being procured.
57	Will the offeror be able to receive all TORs even though their DoD-PA might not be the solution that the service owner is anticipating?	TORs will be provided to the offeror's with the capabilities necessary to the requirement. Unless an exception applies all requirements will be announced on FED BIZ Ops prior to issuing the TOR.
58	Fixed Price Redetermination – Prospective contracts are only appropriate for use when the conditions for use of a firm-fixed-price contract are not present (see FAR 16.205-3 Limitations). Given commercial cloud solutions are commercial based, and price competition within the pool of BOA holders allows for establishment of fair and reasonable prices at the outset, use of the Fix Price Redetermination Prospective type structure is not appropriate for such services. Recommend deletion of this clause from the BOA.	This clause is included since there may be conditions where it is not possible to Firm Fix price the whole period of performance. It remains necessary.
59	The following list of Attachments cover R1 through R21. Are there 24 or 21 attachments?	There are only 21 attachments, a couple were removed prior to posting. The statement on Page 46 will be amended to read 21.
60	Will the Government please allow offerors to use a smaller font for tables, figures, and graphics as long as the font is readable?	No, please use the font/size listed in the RFP.
61	Please confirm that a screen print of the SAM website, reflecting the offeror's Entity Registration Summary, will be adequate to meet this requirement.	See answers above to Questions 53 and 55 above.
62	Will the Government please clarify if contractor CSO's may need to support SRG Impact Levels 2-6, FedRAMP Moderate only can support Impact Levels 2?	FEDRAMP does NOT meet the requirements for this solicitation. The TOR requirements may cover SRG Impact levels 2-6. The BOA proposal only covers Impact level 2.
63	Is modernization scope limited to re-factoring and/or consolidation? Is the government open to other types of modernization efforts like re-engineering of the application, or replacing it with Commercial/ Government Off the Shelf products like SAP, Sales Force?	Ultimately the type of approach used for Modernization will be evaluated by the Organization's TOR folks. However the BOA requests the offeror "identify approaches to modernize...". Provide the recommended approach for the established criteria.
64	During the TOR proposal process, will the offeror be able to add a CSO with DoD-PA to their BOA to support the specific TOR?	If there are changes to a BOA holders PA levels; a request to add them should be submitted for addition to the contract matrix.

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
65	<p>At a briefing last month on the Basic Safeguarding of Contract Information Systems FAR clause (i.e., FAR 52.204-21), contractors were informed that they should, at the request for proposal (RFP) stage, ask agencies for an explanation of their interpretation of FAR 52.204-21. We noted that FAR 52.204-21 has been incorporated into the RFP, and we respectfully request that the agency provide its interpretation of the requirements of the clause as it applies to the current RFP (Solicitation No. W52P1J-16-R-0194).</p>	<p>FAR PART 4.1903 States: "The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 52.204-21, Basic Safeguarding of Covered Contractor Information Systems, in solicitations and contracts when the contractor or a subcontractor at any tier may have Federal contract information residing in or transiting through its information system."</p> <p>This is likely under the TORs. There aren't any requirements being awarded under the BOA. When the Specific TOR requirements are provided, this should be requested then, if not clearly identified within the TOR Scope.</p>
66	<p>Regarding the government's response to question #23.</p> <p>As required in the Department of Defense, Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide and a recent briefing (see below) Assessment Applicability. The government Impact Level 2 – DoD PA assessment is no long required if the Cloud Service Offering (CSO) has a Fed RAMP JAB PA or Agency ATO.</p> <p>Therefore, please confirm the response should be that FedRAMP JAB P-ATO automatically grants DOD PA Level 2 based on reciprocity. A letter from Fed Ramp JAB should be sufficient.</p> <p>Here is a copy from a DoD/DISA briefing slide from 2015. Impact Level 2 – DoD PA assessment is no long required if the Cloud Service Offering (CSO) has a FedRAMP JAB PA or Agency ATO.</p>	<p>The ARMY's Requirement is that a DOD -PA is required to receive an ACCENT BOA. In coordination with DISA, It's virtually an automatic process to get a Level 2 DoD PA once FedRAMP JAB PA is granted.</p> <p>The answer to Question 23 was coordinated with the author of the SRG and the lead for DoD PAs.</p>
67	<p>Section H: Step 2: b(i): The Product Lead Enterprise Computing (PL EC) Army Application Migration Business Office (AAMBO) serves as the requiring activity focal point for all ACCENT requirements. Will the TORs be issued by AAMBO or by mission/application owners at individual Army commands?</p>	<p>TORs may be issued by ARMY Contracting Centers.</p>

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
68	Section C: PWS: III.b.2 and III.c: Cloud Hosting On-premise and Cloud Hosting in Mobile Data Centers. Are all BOA holders expected to have the capability to build/ provide on-premise and/or mobile cloud hosting/computing centers?	BOA holders are expected to have the minimum requirements listed in section L and M. The entire scope of potential TORs includes Mobil Data Centers. If this requirement is necessary under a TOR, it will be separately evaluated by the TOR process.
69	Does on-premise cloud hosting refer to DISA Milcloud?	No, On-premise cloud hosting refers to a commercial cloud service provider instantiating their cloud service offering on a DoD site. If an application owner/AAMBO decides to move an application/system to milCloud it will not be competed through an ACCENT TO.
70	How will Cloud Hosting On-premise and Cloud Hosting in Mobile Data Centers capability be evaluated? There is no evaluation factor or criteria defined to demonstrate capability to provision, maintain, operate and support data centers, to perform data center management tasks etc.	See answer to number 70.
71	How are offers to demonstrate FedRamp and DoD PA for on-premise cloud computing capabilities where infrastructure (fixed or mobile) has not yet been built?	A DoD PA is not granted for on-premise or off-premise. A PA is granted for Impact level and deployment model(public, private, hybrid, community)
72	Please confirm only the prime offeror who is authorized to enter into the BOA agreement is required to submit representations and certifications and additional data from SAM, and not proposed subcontractors.	Confirmed
73	Please advise if offerors are to include a printout of the representations and certifications from SAM. Furthermore, if offerors are to include a printout from SAM, can the Government please clarify which printout offerors are to include (i.e. FARS, FARS and DFARS, Reps and Certs, or Entity Record)?	Everything included in Certifications and representations to include Offeror's CAGE CODE
74	Please confirm Small Businesses are not required to complete the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.	Confirmed

	ACCENT Questions Submitted	USG Answers
75	Answers to questions indicate that offerors are required to include a copy of the entire 62 page RFP in Section I as part of the proposal. The inclusion of the 62 page RFP, with the required header and footer, will substantially increase the electronic file size of the submission. Will the Government please consider requiring offerors to <i>only</i> include the SF-33 Signature page and the completed Section K from the solicitation in the Section I proposal response?	The entire solicitation is required. The electronic size was not a limitation of the proposal. Only page counts.
76	Please confirm that customized MECS plans, if applicable, will be submitted with Task Order proposals, and that a MECS plan is not required at the BOA level.	A MEC is not requested as part of the BOA submission
77	Do both the Covers and Table of Contents count toward page limitations?	Yes, Table of Contents are not requested. Cover letters should include the Attachment 0001 section L - 1-6 administrative information if included.
78	The PWS includes 14 subtasks to address and only 13 pages are permitted for Section III. As the Government is requiring Arial 12pt font for all text in the proposal, will the Government please consider increasing the page limitation for Section III to 15 pages to permit a sufficiently detailed discussion of the offeror's approach?	The page count for section III remains 13
79	This vendor has continued to move forward on responding to the Army's ACCENT RFP and its Attachments, and the Q&As to date. There are many business and technical requirements therein, including a range of FAR/DFARS clauses. This requires a series of consultations with our counsel toward getting corporate approvals-which would take time. Therefore, we respectfully ask the Army to extend the proposal submission deadline by 2 weeks, i.e., to 1:00 pm CDT, Friday, October 21, 2016.	The due date remains October 7th, 2016